Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I was stunned this morning to pick up the newspaper and read in an article in Newsday dated July 22 that a columnist blew a CIA agent's cover. That is the headline of this article. Now, Robert Novak, who is the columnist who did this, said they came to me, they thought it was significant, they gave me the name and I used it. That is a criminal offense. To give the name of an American member of the CIA to uncover them is a criminal offense. Somebody in the administration thought it was important to let that news out. So they went to Mr. Novak, he is one of the Republican Party's pets in the press, and they knew it would go right into the press.

But when will the investigation start in this House by the Republicans of the Republican administration people who broke the law? Who in the White House had the gall to think they were above the law and they could go down and take a reporter and say let me give you the name of one of our undercover agents who has been operating abroad? Members may ask themselves why would they do that? Were they threatening her or did they want other people to understand, do not talk anything bad about this administration? This administration is trying to make the American people afraid to speak up and dissent. They did this because she happened to be the wife of somebody that the administration sent to Niger to find out the truth of the forgeries that the President spoke about here in this very place. When he came back and gave his report, his report was ignored and they insisted upon putting it into the speech.

Mr. Speaker, the question you have to ask is, who is writing the laws that cover the White House and the administration? Or are they operating on their own? They could do anything and the stonewall on the Republican side of the House of Representatives will never bring it up. I guarantee Members there will not be any attempt to have an investigation by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; of course, we trust them, yes.

Today, Mr. Bremer is going to sneak into this room and they are going to lock the doors and he is going to tell us a lot of things. Imagine what would happen if I or the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) or even the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) were to stand in this well and say the name of an undercover CIA agent. They would be in the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in 15 minutes. They would be hanging by their thumbs; but not Mr. Novak and not those people in the White House. They get a free pass. They do not operate under the same laws you and I do. This is becoming a pretty strange place where the White House, whose job it is to enforce the laws of the United States, that is what the executive branch is about, right in the bowels of the White House, we have somebody who feels no compunction whatsoever to go out in the street and hand this information out. I am waiting for the investigation.

CHILE AND SINGAPORE FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 4 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Singapore free trade agreement with the United States. This week we will be debating and voting on the free trade agreements with Chile and Singapore. I stand in support of these because I believe that these agreements will not only nurture our friendship and relationship with these great nations, but also will be in the best interests of the United States.

In terms of direct economic benefits, there are three broad areas that I believe in particular the United States will gain benefit from with this free trade agreement with Singapore: goods, services, and intellectual property.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America is friends with Singapore, and we value the relationship we have. The relationship with Singapore's ambassador to the United States and also our relationship with Singapore is one that needs to be strengthened and nurtured. By signing this free trade agreement, we are going to bring into play the opportunity for America and Singapore, who we already share so many good things in context with from business relationships, but we are going to codify this free trade agreement around the ability we have in our legal systems to not only work together and agree with the differences that we may have, but to be able to do business in an ever-increasing small world, a world where the things that we do here in the United States are the things that are done in Singapore, and to make sure these difference are resolved properly.

Intellectual property is one of the key components of the intelligence and strength of this country, and I believe that this free trade agreement will allow the free flow of not only intellectual property but the things that come as a result of that. This agreement updates also Singapore's intellectual property laws, and as was noted by Thomas Lipscomb on June 10 in the Wall Street Journal, ''Entertainment content is now America's largest export, and information is the basis of more than half of our gross domestic product.''

Mr. Speaker, I will tell Members that this free trade agreement with Singapore is going to be one that will benefit Singapore and the great people of this Nation. I stand in support of this free trade agreement. It is about jobs, about intellectual property, it is about goods and services. It is about a relationship with one of America's greatest trading partners and allies, Singapore.

OPPOSING FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 4 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the free trade agreement which has been discussed here today for a variety of reasons. I think Members understand that we need to trade and understand that we have an obligation to trade, and for our citizens to have an ability to trade and to buy goods and services. I think many people in this Chamber understand the concept of comparative advantage where certain countries have certain strengths and that we need to tap into those strengths; but I cannot understand, I am having a difficult time as I listen to the previous speakers talk about intellectual property, talk about copyrights, talk about piracy, talk about customs, these are priorities when we negotiate these agreements.

The intellectual property has become our priority, and we need to protect them, but why when we are negotiating these agreements can we not put the same energy and the same conviction into our environmental standards, into labor standards, that we believe in in this country and that we have stood for for many, many years, the great strides through the last century that we have made in the environment, for our labor standards, protection of workers, and we are beginning to see the race to the bottom where manufacturing jobs leave this country, they go to Mexico? They leave Mexico and they go to China because the labor standards there and the environmental standards there are so low that the capital begins to chase to the lowest common denominator.

That is the problem I have with these agreements. And the other speakers kept talking about the intellectual property and kept talking about the copyrights, and that is because those people who want those aspects of the agreement protected are sitting at the table. They are the ones sitting there negotiating these agreements, and so they are making sure that their interests are protected. When are the interests of the environment going to be protected in these agreements? When are the interests of the labor folks and the workers that are being taken advantage of, when are they going to be at the table?

Mr. Speaker, until they are, I am not going to support these agreements. We have an obligation in this country to support and to promote our values. The last speaker talked about what the U.S. will gain. They will gain goods, services, and protections in intellectual property. I want to see trade